



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM  
Christopher Seppanen  
Executive Director

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: June 13, 2016  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-003588  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susanne E. Harris

### **HEARING DECISION**

Following the Petitioner's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, an in-person hearing was held on May 12, 2016, from Lansing, Michigan. The Petitioner, [REDACTED], appeared and testified with his mother, [REDACTED]. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department) was represented by Hearing Facilitator, [REDACTED].

### **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

The hearing was originally scheduled for May 3, 2016. On April 11, 2016, the Michigan Administrative Hearing System received the Petitioner's request for an in-person hearing. On April 13, 2016, this Administrative Law Judge issued an Adjournment Order for an In-Person hearing. The hearing was then rescheduled until May 12, 2016 and commenced as rescheduled. After the hearing, on May 13, 2016, this Administrative Law Judge issued an Interim Order Extending the Record to afford the Petitioner an opportunity to submit additional, medical evidence. That evidence was received on May 27, 2016 and the record closed at that time.

The following exhibits were offered and admitted into evidence:

Department: A-July 31, 2015, Assistance Application.

B-Medical Packet.

C-December 1, 2015, Medical Review Team (MRT) denial.

D-December 17, 2015, Notice of Case Action.

Petitioner: 1-April 28, 2016 letter from DPM Rick W. Tiller and April 29, 2016, letter from PAC [REDACTED].

2-May 16, 2016, Medical Examination Report form completed by Dr. [REDACTED].

■■■■■

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that the Petitioner was not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefit program?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. On July 31, 2015, the Petitioner applied for SDA.
2. On December 1, 2015, the Medical Review Team denied the Petitioner's request.
3. On March 11, 2016, the Petitioner submitted to the Department a request for hearing.
4. The Petitioner is ■■■ years old.
5. The Petitioner completed education through high school.
6. The Petitioner has employment experience and last worked in 2008 as a truck driver.
7. The Petitioner's limitations have lasted for 12 months or more.
8. The Petitioner suffers from a very severe, chronic constipation which is only relieved with magnesium citrate, at least 300 mg, everyday. As a result, the Petitioner also suffers daily from severe diarrhea which then results in severe fatigue. The Petitioner also suffers from a radical removal of the soft tissue mass in his right foot, twice, several years ago and continues to have follow-up injections there on a routine basis. The Petitioner needs to wear open sandals or an athletic shoe with the laces untied to be relatively comfortable. The Petitioner also suffers from a previously dislocated right elbow, high blood pressure, carpal tunnel, diabetes and peripheral neuropathy.
9. The Petitioner has significant limitations on physical activities involving sitting, standing, walking, bending, lifting, and squatting.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers the SDA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151 – 400.3180. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness, automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

The Department conforms to State statute in administering the SDA program.

2000 PA 294, Sec. 604, of the statute states:

Sec. 604. (1) The department shall operate a state disability assistance program. Except as provided in subsection (3), persons eligible for this program shall include needy citizens of the United States or aliens exempted from the supplemental security income citizenship requirement who are at least 18 years of age or emancipated minors meeting 1 or more of the following requirements:

- (a) A recipient of supplemental security income, social security, or medical assistance due to disability or 65 years of age or older.
- (b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal supplemental security income disability standards, except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days. Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department uses the Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...the inability to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.... 20 CFR 416.905.

A set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience are reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work). 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1, 12.00(C).

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated. 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, published by the Department of Labor. 20 CFR 416.967.

Pursuant to 20 CFR 416.920, a five-step sequential evaluation process is used to determine disability. An individual's current work activity, the severity of the impairment, the residual functional capacity, past work, age, education and work experience are evaluated. If an individual is found disabled or not disabled at any point, no further review is made.

The first step is to determine if an individual is working and if that work is "substantial gainful activity" (SGA). If the work is SGA, an individual is not considered disabled regardless of medical condition, age or other vocational factors. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

Secondly, the individual must have a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" or a combination of impairments that is "severe." 20 CFR 404.1520(c). An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work. 20 CFR 404.1521;

Social Security Rulings (SSRs) 85-28, 96-3p, and 96-4p. If the Petitioner does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, he is not disabled. If the Petitioner has a severe impairment or combination of impairments, the analysis proceeds to the third step.

The third step in the process is to assess whether the impairment or combination of impairments meets a Social Security listing. If the impairment or combination of impairments meets or is the medically equivalent of a listed impairment as set forth in Appendix 1 and meets the durational requirements of 20 CFR 404.1509, the individual is considered disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

Before considering step four of the sequential evaluation process, the trier must determine the Petitioner's residual functional capacity. 20 CFR 404.1520(e). An individual's residual functional capacity is his ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from his impairments. In making this finding, the trier must consider all of the Petitioner's impairments, including impairments that are not severe. 20 CFR 404.1520(e) and 404.1545; SSR 96-8p.

The fourth step of the process is whether the Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of his past relevant work. 20 CFR 404.1520(f). The term past relevant work means work performed (either as the Petitioner actually performed it or as is it generally performed in the national economy) within the last 15 years or 15 years prior to the date that disability must be established. If the Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to do his past relevant work, then the Petitioner is not disabled. If the Petitioner is unable to do any past relevant work or does not have any past relevant work, the analysis proceeds to the fifth step.

In the fifth step, an individual's residual functional capacity is considered in determining whether disability exists. An individual's age, education, work experience and skills are used to evaluate whether an individual has the residual functional capacity to perform work despite limitations. 20 CFR 416.920(e).

Here, the Petitioner has satisfied requirements as set forth in steps one, two and three of the sequential evaluation. However, the Petitioner's impairments do not meet a listing as set forth in Appendix 1, 20 CFR 416.926. Therefore, vocational factors will be considered to determine the Petitioner's residual functional capacity to do relevant work.

In the present case, the Petitioner has been diagnosed with very severe, chronic constipation which is only relieved with magnesium citrate, at least 300 mg, everyday. As a result, the Petitioner also suffers daily from severe diarrhea, which then results in severe fatigue. The Petitioner testified that every day of his life is like going through the preparation for colonoscopy. At least one day a week, he needs to take a double dose of the magnesium citrate to make sure he is completely relieved.

The Petitioner also suffers from a radical removal of the soft tissue mass in his right foot, twice, several years ago and continues to have follow-up injections on a routine

basis. The Petitioner needs to wear open sandals or an athletic shoe with the laces untied to be relatively comfortable. The Petitioner also suffers from a previously dislocated right elbow, high blood pressure, carpal tunnel, diabetes and peripheral neuropathy.

The Petitioner has a number of symptoms and limitations, as cited above, as a result of these conditions. The Petitioner testified that he can stand for 10 minutes and sit for one half hour before he has to shift. The Petitioner's treating physician noted that the Petitioner would be able to frequently lift up to 10 pounds and only occasionally lift up to 20 pounds, but is to never lift more than 25 pounds. The Petitioner's treating physician indicates that the Petitioner cannot use his feet or legs to operate foot or leg controls. The Petitioner's treating physician also indicates that the Petitioner cannot use his hands and arms for fine manipulating, reaching, simple grasping and pushing and pulling.

The fourth step of the analysis to be considered is whether the Petitioner has the ability to perform work previously performed by the Petitioner within the past 15 years. The trier of fact must determine whether the impairment(s) presented prevent the Petitioner from doing past relevant work. In the present case, the Petitioner's past employment was as a truck driver. This required the Petitioner to be sitting in a truck for hours on end and using his feet and legs to operate foot and leg controls. The Petitioner's impairments prevent the Petitioner from being able to perform the duties for such a position. This Administrative Law Judge finds, based on the medical evidence and objective, physical findings, that the Petitioner is not capable of the physical activities required to perform any such position. 20 CFR 416.920(e).

In the final step of the analysis, the trier of fact must determine if the Petitioner's impairment(s) prevent the Petitioner from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the Petitioner's:

1. residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite your limitations?" 20 CFR 416.945;
2. age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-965; and
3. the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the Petitioner could perform despite her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated. 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, published by the Department of Labor. 20 CFR 416.967.

Sedentary work. Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

Light work. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little; a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls. 20 CFR 416.967(b).

Medium work. Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c).

Heavy work. Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich App 690, 696 (1987). Once the Petitioner makes it to the final step of the analysis, the Petitioner has already established a *prima facie* case of disability. *Richardson v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 732 F2d 962 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1984). Moving forward, the burden of proof rests with the State to prove by substantial evidence that the Petitioner has the residual function capacity for SGA.

After careful review of the Petitioner's medical record and the Administrative Law Judge's personal consideration of the Petitioner's testimony at the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Petitioner's exertional impairments render the Petitioner unable to engage in a full range of sedentary work activities on a regular and continuing basis. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 11, Section 201.00(h). See Social Security Ruling 83-10; *Wilson v. Heckler*, 743 F2d 216 (1986).

The record supports a finding that the Petitioner does not have the residual functional capacity for SGA. The Department has failed to provide vocational evidence which establishes that, given the Petitioner's age, education, and work experience, there are

significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which the Petitioner could perform despite the Petitioner's limitations. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Petitioner is disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Petitioner is medically disabled as of July, 2015.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is hereby **REVERSED** and the Department is ORDERED to initiate a review of the application dated July 31, 2015, if not done previously, to determine Petitioner's non-medical eligibility. The Department shall inform the Petitioner of the determination in writing. A review of this case shall be set for July, 2017.



SH/nr

---

Susanne E. Harris  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MAHS within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088; Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139



DHHS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Petitioner

[REDACTED]